

Degree in Social Sciences. In 1949, she was conferred an M.A. Degree in Social Sciences from the Colorado State College in Greeley, Colorado.

Betty went on to become active in Guam's political, civic, and community affairs. Having married an island-resident, Joe Castro Guerrero, Betty moved to Guam in the 1950's. From 1951 to 1960, she worked as a teacher in the Guam public school system. Between 1954 and 1957, she also worked as a part-time instructor at the University of Guam. In 1960, prior to being hired as a budget and management analyst for the Government of Guam's Bureau of Budget and Management, she made a move from teaching to school administration. In 1968, she was named director of the Head Start program for the University of Guam and, in 1969, she became the assistant to the President of the University.

From 1969 to 1976, Betty administered the Comprehensive Health Planning Program while, at the same time, serving as Executive Director to the Territorial Planning Council. She worked as a consultant for the Guam Legislature's Committee on Territorial-Federal Affairs from 1977 until 1979, when she was named Director of the Bureau of Planning. She served under this capacity until 1983. In 1984, she resumed work with the Department of Education as an opportunity room teacher. She worked for this program designed to help troubled students until 1987.

Although she might have taken it slow after her Department of Education job, Betty never really retired. She kept herself occupied with a wide range of activities. She was always willing to impart and share her expertise, enthusiasm, and energies to deserving activities and projects. We have been blessed to have her choose to be part of our community. The legacy she leaves behind includes almost five decades of government and community service. She will be greatly missed by all of us on Guam.

On behalf of the people of Guam, I join her children, Leonard, Clarice, and Stephen, who, together with her grandchildren, Nicole, Ashley, Kathleen, Mason, and Stephen II, in celebrating her life and mourning the loss of a mother, a grandmother, and fellow educator. Adios, Betty.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT THE PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1999

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 33, the proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit the physical desecration of our flag. And, in this respect, I take no pleasure in doing so: Like the vast majority of Americans, I too condemn those malcontents who would desecrate our flag—a universal symbol for democracy, freedom and liberty—to grab attention for themselves and inflame the passions of patriotic Americans.

Further, I fully appreciate and respect the motivations of those who offer and support

this amendment, particularly the patriotic men and women who so faithfully served this Nation in our armed services and in other capacities. Their strong feelings on this issue should neither be questioned nor underestimated. They deserve our respect.

However, I respectfully disagree with them and will oppose this amendment for the reasons so eloquently articulated by Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky. In opposing a similar amendment a few years ago, Senator McConnell stated that it "rips the fabric of our Constitution at its very center: the First Amendment." He added, "Our respect and reverence for the flag should not provoke us to damage our Constitution, even in the name of patriotism."

Those of us who oppose this amendment do so not to countenance the actions of a few misfits, but because we believe the question before us today is how we—the United States of America—are to deal with individuals who dishonor our Nation in this manner.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a constitutional amendment is neither the appropriate nor best method for dealing with these malcontents. As the late Justice Brennan wrote for the Supreme Court in *Texas v. Johnson*: "The way to preserve the flag's special role is not to punish those who feel differently about these matters. It is to persuade them that they are wrong. . . . We can imagine no more appropriate response to burning a flag than waving one's own."

Furthermore, it troubles me that this amendment, if approved, would ensconce the vile actions of a few provocateurs into the very document that guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom to petition the government. That document, of course, is our Constitution.

In more than 200 years, our Constitution has been amended only 27 times, and nearly all of those amendments guarantee or expand rights, liberties and freedoms. Only one amendment—prohibition—constricted freedoms and soon was repealed.

I simply do not believe that our traditions, our values, our democratic principles—all embodied in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights—should be overridden to prohibit this particular manner of speech, even though I completely disagree with it.

Free speech is often a double-edged sword. However, if we value the freedoms that define us as Americans, we should refrain from amending the Constitution to limit those same freedoms to avoid being offended.

Finally, while even one act of flag burning is one too many, I do not believe that flag desecration is rampant in our Nation or so harms the Republic that nothing short of a constitutional amendment is needed.

I remind my colleagues that if we approve this amendment, we put our great Nation in the company of the oppressive regimes in China, Iran, and Cuba—all of whom have similar laws protecting their flags. Needless to say, when it comes to free speech, the United States of America is the world's leader. It does not follow China, Iran or Cuba.

Our flag is far more than a piece of cloth, a few stripes, 50 stars. Our flag is a universal symbol for freedom, liberty, human rights and decency that is recognized throughout the world. The inflammatory actions of a few misfits cannot extinguish those ideals. We can

only do that ourselves. And I submit that a constitutional amendment to restrict speech—even speech such as this—is the surest way to stoke the embers of those who will push for even more restrictions.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF CASEYVILLE

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 150th Anniversary of the Village of Caseyville.

The Village of Caseyville first began to be settled in the 1840's. While today the area is well known for its small town charm, it was recognized in the 19th century as a coal-mining community.

Coal was not only a source of fuel and economic prosperity, but it influenced the further development of the community as well as regional transportation. Indeed, one of the first railroads in St. Clair County began in Caseyville, sponsored by the Illinois Coal Company.

Caseyville has also long been recognized as a quiet force in Illinois politics. The namesake of the town, Zadok Casey, served in the Illinois State Assembly as both a State Representative, State Senator, and Lieutenant Governor. He eventually served in the U.S. Congress before returning to the Illinois Assembly to serve in the State House and State Senate again.

Today, I am proud to represent Caseyville, a close community of churches, civic groups, and businesses. This weekend as the Nation celebrates the anniversary of our country's independence, Caseyville residents will also proudly remember their own place in American History.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Village of Caseyville in commemoration of its 150th Anniversary.

THE GENETIC NONDISCRIMINATION IN HEALTH INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT ACT

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to announce the introduction of the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Employment Act, a bill that will protect all Americans against the misuse of their genetic information.

Genetic information is among the most powerful, personal, and private information we can have about ourselves. Increasingly, genetics can give us insights into the fundamental characteristics that make us individuals—into what makes our eyes blue, our skin freckled, our bones more prone to breaking, our family members unusually long-lived. Yet while genetic information can offer insights, it rarely extends guarantees. Few genes carry an absolute assurance of developing a given condition or disease. Rather, the vast majority of